

ABSTRACT

A system and method for sending temporally displaced electronic messages over a network from a sender to a recipient. The sending system is configured to allow the user to encode a temporal specifier into an electronic message to be sent over the network to a recipient at a destination address on the network. The electronic message is received over the network by a retention system which decodes the temporal specifier and stores the electronic message, sending to the destination in accord with the temporal specifier. In addition, the inventive teachings provide for the integration of additional content with the electronic messages and the use of cross-media communication of messages exemplified for escalating message priority.

General Information		Study Design		Study Population		Intervention		Outcome Measures		Results		Conclusions	
Author	Year	Design	Setting	Sample Size	Age Range	Intervention	Control	Primary Outcome	Secondary Outcome	Effect Size	Significance	Limitations	Strengths
Smith et al.	2015	Randomized Controlled Trial	University Hospital	120	18-65	Group A: 60	Group B: 60	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.5	p < 0.05	Small Sample Size	High Internal Validity
Johnson et al.	2016	Quasi-Experimental	Community Center	80	25-70	Group C: 40	Group D: 40	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.3	p < 0.1	No Randomization	Real-World Setting
Williams et al.	2017	Systematic Review	Meta-Analysis	15 Studies	18-80	Intervention	Control	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.7	p < 0.001	Heterogeneity	Comprehensive Search
Miller et al.	2018	Case Study	Private Practice	10	30-50	Group E: 5	Group F: 5	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.2	p > 0.05	Small Sample Size	Qualitative Data
Chen et al.	2019	Randomized Controlled Trial	Research Institute	200	20-75	Group G: 100	Group H: 100	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.6	p < 0.01	Large Sample Size	High External Validity
Lee et al.	2020	Quasi-Experimental	Community Center	90	25-70	Group I: 45	Group J: 45	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.4	p < 0.05	No Randomization	Real-World Setting
Wang et al.	2021	Systematic Review	Meta-Analysis	20 Studies	18-80	Intervention	Control	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.8	p < 0.001	Heterogeneity	Comprehensive Search
Kim et al.	2022	Case Study	Private Practice	12	30-50	Group K: 6	Group L: 6	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.1	p > 0.05	Small Sample Size	Qualitative Data
Nguyen et al.	2023	Randomized Controlled Trial	Research Institute	250	20-75	Group M: 125	Group N: 125	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.9	p < 0.001	Large Sample Size	High External Validity
Patel et al.	2024	Quasi-Experimental	Community Center	110	25-70	Group O: 55	Group P: 55	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.5	p < 0.05	No Randomization	Real-World Setting
Anderson et al.	2025	Systematic Review	Meta-Analysis	25 Studies	18-80	Intervention	Control	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	1.0	p < 0.001	Heterogeneity	Comprehensive Search
Thompson et al.	2026	Case Study	Private Practice	15	30-50	Group Q: 7	Group R: 8	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.3	p > 0.05	Small Sample Size	Qualitative Data
White et al.	2027	Randomized Controlled Trial	Research Institute	300	20-75	Group S: 150	Group T: 150	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	1.1	p < 0.001	Large Sample Size	High External Validity
Green et al.	2028	Quasi-Experimental	Community Center	130	25-70	Group U: 65	Group V: 65	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.6	p < 0.05	No Randomization	Real-World Setting
Black et al.	2029	Systematic Review	Meta-Analysis	30 Studies	18-80	Intervention	Control	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	1.2	p < 0.001	Heterogeneity	Comprehensive Search
Gray et al.	2030	Case Study	Private Practice	18	30-50	Group W: 9	Group X: 9	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.4	p > 0.05	Small Sample Size	Qualitative Data

General Information		Study Design		Study Population		Intervention		Outcome Measures		Results		Conclusions	
Author	Year	Design	Setting	Sample Size	Age Range	Intervention	Control	Primary Outcome	Secondary Outcome	Effect Size	Significance	Limitations	Strengths
Smith et al.	2015	Randomized Controlled Trial	University Hospital	120	18-65	Group A: 60	Group B: 60	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.5	p < 0.05	Small Sample Size	High Internal Validity
Johnson et al.	2016	Quasi-Experimental	Community Center	80	25-70	Group C: 40	Group D: 40	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.3	p < 0.1	No Randomization	Real-World Setting
Williams et al.	2017	Systematic Review	Meta-Analysis	15 Studies	18-80	Intervention	Control	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.7	p < 0.001	Heterogeneity	Comprehensive Search
Miller et al.	2018	Case Study	Private Practice	10	30-50	Group E: 5	Group F: 5	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.2	p > 0.05	Small Sample Size	Qualitative Data
Chen et al.	2019	Randomized Controlled Trial	Research Institute	200	20-75	Group G: 100	Group H: 100	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.6	p < 0.01	Large Sample Size	High External Validity
Lee et al.	2020	Quasi-Experimental	Community Center	90	25-70	Group I: 45	Group J: 45	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.4	p < 0.05	No Randomization	Real-World Setting
Wang et al.	2021	Systematic Review	Meta-Analysis	20 Studies	18-80	Intervention	Control	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.8	p < 0.001	Heterogeneity	Comprehensive Search
Kim et al.	2022	Case Study	Private Practice	12	30-50	Group K: 6	Group L: 6	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.1	p > 0.05	Small Sample Size	Qualitative Data
Nguyen et al.	2023	Randomized Controlled Trial	Research Institute	250	20-75	Group M: 125	Group N: 125	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.9	p < 0.001	Large Sample Size	High External Validity
Patel et al.	2024	Quasi-Experimental	Community Center	110	25-70	Group O: 55	Group P: 55	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.5	p < 0.05	No Randomization	Real-World Setting
Anderson et al.	2025	Systematic Review	Meta-Analysis	25 Studies	18-80	Intervention	Control	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	1.0	p < 0.001	Heterogeneity	Comprehensive Search
Thompson et al.	2026	Case Study	Private Practice	15	30-50	Group Q: 7	Group R: 8	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.3	p > 0.05	Small Sample Size	Qualitative Data
White et al.	2027	Randomized Controlled Trial	Research Institute	300	20-75	Group S: 150	Group T: 150	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	1.1	p < 0.001	Large Sample Size	High External Validity
Green et al.	2028	Quasi-Experimental	Community Center	130	25-70	Group U: 65	Group V: 65	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.6	p < 0.05	No Randomization	Real-World Setting
Black et al.	2029	Systematic Review	Meta-Analysis	30 Studies	18-80	Intervention	Control	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	1.2	p < 0.001	Heterogeneity	Comprehensive Search
Gray et al.	2030	Case Study	Private Practice	18	30-50	Group W: 9	Group X: 9	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	0.4	p > 0.05	Small Sample Size	Qualitative Data

